

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3

4 TESSERA, INC.,

No. C 05-4063 CW

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC., et
al.,

8 Defendant.

9 _____/ 10 TESSERA, INC.,

No. C 12-692 CW

11 Plaintiff,

12 v. ORDER REGARDING
MOTIONS TO ALTER
CASE SCHEDULE

13 MOTOROLA, INC., et al.,

14 Defendant. (Re: Docket Nos.
1377, 1379, 1380)

15 AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS
16 _____/

17 Plaintiff Tessera, Inc., Defendant Qualcomm, Inc., and
18 Defendants STMicroelectronics, Inc. and STMicroelectronics N.V.
19 (ST) all move to alter the case schedule to accommodate the Court-
20 appointed expert's (CAE) request to extend the deadline for his
21 expert report to March 14, 2014. Of the three competing
22 proposals, the Court finds that ST's has the advantage. ST's
23 proposed adjustment provides sufficient time for the Court to
24 consider the parties' summary judgment motions and for the parties
25 to attend another mediation following the CAE's opinion.

26 Accordingly, ST's proposal is adopted:

27

28

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

Event	Date
CAE Report	March 14, 2014
CAE Dep. Deadline	April 1, 2014
Tessera's Summary Judgment (SJ) and Claim Construction (CC)	April 7, 2014 ¹
Defendants' SJ and CC; Response to Tessera SJ	April 21, 2014
Defendants' Reply SJ and CC	April 29, 2014
CAE Advisory Opinion on CC	June 2, 2014
Deadline for Mandatory Mediation for all parties	June 13, 2014
CMC and Hearing on CC and SJ	June 19, 2014
Pretrial Conference	October 13, 2014
Jury Trial	November 10, 2014

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 3/20/2014


CLAUDIA WILKEN
United States District Judge

¹ Because Tessera has already filed its summary judgment brief in advance of the new deadline, it may withdraw its motion, giving notice to Defendants and the Court without delay, and refile before the new deadline.